

Work From Home (WFH) during Covid-19: Perceptions of Researchers

Amina parveen
School of Education and
Behavioural sciences

Shazia Jan, Insha Rasool, Syed Inshaallah Tahir
PhD Candidate, School of Education and
Behavioural sciences

Abstract:- People's employment and personal life have been shattered as a result of the pandemic (Venkatesh, 2020), much of which can be related to the abrupt transition to WFH. WFH is currently considered as a viable approach for reducing the risk of COVID-19 infection. The investigators used an online survey to discover about the researchers' perceptions of their Work from Home (WFH) experience during Covid 19. The survey's findings are based on the responses of 172 respondents (researchers). Despite some beneficial aspects of WFH, researchers' general view toward their WFH experience is still negative. 86% of the researchers are not satisfied with the progress of their research work due to WFH. Among the respondents 62.8% disagreed to work more from home after the lockdown as WFH impedes the speed of research's research work progress (79%), decrease productivity of research work (83.7%) and hinders the development of new research skills (83.8%). Moreover, to WFH isolated the researchers from rest of their colleagues and makes them feel lonelier (75.1%) which in turn can diminish the excitement and enthusiasm of the researchers (88.4%). In general, communication among co-researchers of the research lab/team (86.1%) and communication with the Supervisor/research guide (74.4%) can be challenged by working from home and accordingly it can create difficulties in self-motivation of researchers (83.7%). Moreover, the attitude of researchers toward WFH differs significantly based on gender, marital status and position of researchers.

Keywords: *Work from Home, Covid-19 Pandemic, Gender, Marital Status, Researchers, Position of Researchers.*

I. INTRODUCTION

People's employment and personal life have been shattered as a result of the pandemic (Venkatesh, 2020), much of which can be related to the abrupt transition to WFH. WFH is currently considered as a viable approach for reducing the risk of COVID-19 infection. WFH, however, is not a new concept and has been brought to the attention of numerous schools of thought for a long time. Nilles (1988) first introduced the WFH concept in 1973, referring to it as "telecommuting" or "telework" (Messenger and Gschwind 2016). WFH has been referred to by a variety of terms, including remote work, flexible workplace, telework, telecommuting, and e-working. These terms allude to employees' ability to work in flexible work environments, such as at home, through employing technology to complete job tasks (Gajendran and Harrison 2007; Grant et al. 2019). Telecommuting was defined by Gajendran and Harrison (2007) as an alternative work arrangement in which

employees undertake duties elsewhere that are traditionally performed in primary or central workplaces, for at least some portion of their work schedule, using digital media to engage with others inside and outside the organisation, interestingly, they indicated that "elsewhere" refers to "home."

Workers who work from home have a number of opportunities. Personal comfort as a result of the home environment (e.g., Kurland & Bailey, 1999) is an often-mentioned benefit of WFH, yet setting up a home office has physical and infrastructural requirements (Gurstein, P. 1996). WFH has several other benefits like, easier management of household responsibilities (Wheatley, D. 2017) and family demands (Singley, S. G. 2005), along with increased autonomy over time use (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Kossek & Thompson, 2016) and less interruptions (Kurland & Bailey, 1999; Korbel & Stegle, 2020) greater job motivation and satisfaction (Felstead & Henseke, 2017; Wheatley, D. 2017; Binder & Coad, 2016; Hill, et al. 2003) which is probably due to the greater work-related control and work-life flexibility (Baruch, Y. 2001). Working from home is positively connected to leisure time satisfaction, according to a longitudinal nationally representative sample of 30,000 families in the United Kingdom (Reuschke D, 2019), implying that those who work from home can devote more time to leisure activities. Furthermore, working from home assists employees in balancing and distinguishing their office work from their routine work (Amabile & Kramer, 2013).

WFH also has some negative aspects, such as being alienated from co-workers and feeling alone due to the physical and social distance between co-workers, according to research (Fonner & Roloff, 2012; Pinsonneault & Boisvert 2001). Employees who worked from home had more trouble turning off and working longer hours than those who worked in a traditional office (Felstead & Henseke, 2017). Working from home is especially tough for parents with young children (McCloskey DW, Igarria, 2003), but intrusion from other family members, neighbours, and friends have also been identified as major WFH barriers (Gurstein, P. 1996). Furthermore, being away from the office may result in a lack of exposure, which increases teleworkers' fears of being overlooked for promotions, rewards, and positive performance reviews (Cooper & Kurland, 2002). Increased freedom, on the other hand, places greater demands on workers to control not only the environment, but also themselves. WFH necessitates the development of work-life boundary control methods (Kreiner, et al 2009) as well as self-discipline, self-motivation, and effective time management skills (Richardson & McKenna, 2014). According to

Crosbie and Moore (2004), working from home is not a panacea for modern working life. Those pursuing working from home should carefully assess their goals and personality attributes. Those who work long hours outside the home may realise that work life has suppressed their home life even more. In their study, Gajendra and Harrison (2007) discovered that monitoring a worker's effort at home is difficult, especially when interrupted by private commitments and family members. Such productivity effects would be reflected in a worker's wage level in a competitive labour market. The evidence on the productivity effects of working from home is mixed, although it appears that good effects outnumber negative effects. According to Stevenson and Wolfers (2009), working from home can be more or less beneficial to overall life satisfaction depending on the interactions between work and personal life.

Many individuals thought WFH was a fantasy before the pandemic, but it was thought that such a system could not be implemented in densely populated or undeveloped nations. This is due to the fact that working from home necessitates a peaceful and dedicated space as well as access to modern technology, which can be difficult for individuals who live in tiny spaces (Vyas & Butakhieo 2020). The coronavirus disease outbreak of 2019 (COVID-19) wreaked havoc on academic life as well. Almost all institutions in the world were forced to temporarily close their doors and send all students, faculty, and staff home to work when the pandemic spread over the world. Working-from-home (WFH) was extended and reextended indefinitely, causing university personnel, particularly faculty and scholars, to drastically adjust their work techniques, schedules, and duties. In comparison to the business sector, we know very little about how researchers work from home. Researchers in higher education institutions interact in similar ways. They are usually expected to come to the office, if not for teaching or supervision, then for meetings or to confer with their co-researchers. They work in their lab during the rest of their shift or, if permitted, they may choose to accomplish portion of their work remotely.

Until previously, the academics whose WFH experience had been highlighted were largely those who were enrolled in online distance learning programmes. They reported higher levels of work productivity and happiness, as well as more autonomy, flexibility in workday schedules, and the elimination of undesirable distractions, but they also reported poor communication and a lack of opportunity for skill development. We all know that working from home limits one's ability to govern their time due to domestic responsibilities. Women who work from home, according to Sullivan and Lewis (2006), are better able to fulfil their domestic roles and manage their family responsibilities to their satisfaction, but this comes at the cost of increased perceived work-family conflict (Hilbrecht, et al. 2008). In summary, the impact of WFH on academic life and productivity has gotten little attention until recently. Scientists, on an enormous scale, had to devise ways to continue their study from home during the current pandemic lockdown. By providing proper legislation, services, and infrastructure, institutions were pushed to support WFH arrangements. Some researchers and institutions may have

benefited from the new arrangements and seek to maintain WFH in some form; others may have had comparatively higher obstacles as a result of WFH. The present study aims to explore the researcher's perceptions about their Work from home (WFH) experience during Covid 19. Women's work is repeatedly proven in the research to be more influenced by family duties than men's (van der Lippe T, 2007; van der Lippe T & Jager, 2006). Not surprisingly, female scientists' academic productivity and research time were disrupted more than men's during the COVID-19 epidemic, most likely due to childcare duties (Frederickson, M. 2020; Myers, et al. 2020), thus the study also aimed to investigate researchers' attitudes toward WFH on gender basis, hypothesising that *"there will be a significant difference between the attitudes of male and female researchers toward WFH"* (H1 A). The presence of young children at home also has an effect on the worker's WFH experience, according to the literature. Thus, the study also aims to investigate the researcher's attitude toward WFH based on their marital status, hypothesising that *'there will be a significant difference in the attitude of researchers towards their WFH experience based on their marital status'* (H1 B). Based on the literature the study further hypothesises that *'there will be a significant difference in the attitude of researchers towards their WFH experience based on their position'* (H1 C).

II. MATERIAL AND METHOD

Researchers who had to transfer their research work home owing to the COVID-19 pandemic were surveyed using an online self-constructed questionnaire. The questionnaire has been developed and disseminated to researchers via email and social media. The data gathering questionnaire was divided into two sections in Google Forms. The first part included demographic questions about gender, age group, marital status, and the researcher's position, while the second section was a self-constructed questionnaire about attitudes toward work - from - home (WFH). The questionnaire comprised of 33 statements that assessed researchers' attitudes on working from home (WFH). There are 20 items that measure negative attitudes about WFH and 13 items that reflect positive attitudes toward WFH among these items. On a scale of 1 to 4, the responses were rated. Each item has a four-choice response pattern that ranges from 'strongly agree' (4 points) to 'strongly disagree' (1 point). Positive elements were given a reverse score than negative ones. The questionnaire itself included instructions on how to fill out the demographic information and how to complete the questionnaire.

• Sample

Because the goal of this study was to learn more about researchers' attitudes toward WFH, it focused on increasing the sample size and diversity rather than determining the sample's representativeness. As a result, the questionnaire was sent online through Kashmir university mailing lists, social media, and group-emails to researchers. We don't know how many researchers have viewed our questionnaire because of the nature of our sampling approach. Furthermore, the respondents' residences were not collected. The responses for this

survey were gathered between April and July 2021. In total, 210 researchers responded, but 38 were disqualified

because their responses were inadequate. As a result, the analysis contained 172 responses.

Gender	N	Percentage
Male	68	39.53%
Female	104	60.46%
Total	172	
Marital Status	N	Percentage
Married	44	25.58%
Unmarried	128	74.42%
Total	172	
Position	N	Percentage
Assistant Professor	16	9.31%
Research Scholar	156	90.69%
Total	172	

Table 1: Sample Demographics

III. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The data was processed and analysed using percentage statistics and the t test. Among the 172 participants of the study

S.no.	Items/ statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	Due to work from home during Covid-19 my research work became more efficient as compared to my work before lockdown.	4.7%	23.3%	65.1%	7%
	I would like to work more from home even after the lockdown.	4.7%	32.6%	46.5%	16.3%
	Due to work from home I'm able to well organize my time and schedule my tasks effectively.	4.7%	32.6%	46.5%	16.3%
	To work from home aids me to balance between my research work and family commitments.	2.3%	39.5%	48.8%	9.3%
	To work from home creates difficulties in communicating, sharing and discussing ideas with other members of the research lab/team.	41.9%	44.2%	11.6%	2.3%
	To work from home impedes the speed of my research work progress	20.9%	58.1%	20.9%	-----
	To work from home creates difficulties in arranging and attending research seminars and workshops.	23.3%	48.8%	20.9%	7%
	Due to work from home, I am able to work on my manuscript properly.	7.1%	38.1%	45.2%	9.5%
	Reading literature and analysing the collected data seems to improve due to working from home as compared to working from institution	14%	41.9%	30.2%	14%
	To work from home hinders the development of new research skills.	23.3%	60.5%	11.6%	4.7%
	Work from home worrying me that I'm missing something vital since I'm oblivious to it	16.7%	71.4%	11.9%	-----
	Work from home makes me recognize the overabundance of information and communication.	11.6%	67.4%	20.9%	-----
	During work from home, when teleconferencing, the team's focus shifts away from the work and onto communication	16.3%	60.5%	23.3%	-----
	Work from home acknowledges one's ability	11.6%	58.1%	25.6%	4.7%

	to operate autonomously.				
	Work from home provides a strong sense of personal accountability for one's own work.	14.3%	61.9%	21.4%	2.4%
	While working from home, having difficulties with self-motivation.	44.2%	39.5%	14%	2.3%
	Working from home diminishes productivity of my research work.	18.6%	65.1%	14%	2.3%
	Working from home allows me to be more flexible with my working hours.	20.9%	51.2%	27.9%	---
	Working from home encourages researchers to procrastinate.	29.3%	43.9%	24.4%	2.4%
	Working from home makes researchers feel lonelier.	34.9%	44.2%	16.3%	4.7%
	It's simple to "switch off work mode" when you work from home.	20.9%	58.1%	18.6%	2.3%
	Due to work from home and lockdown measures, my excitement and enthusiasm about my research work has diminished.	27.9%	60.5%	9.3%	2.3%
	Work from home does not satisfy me about the progress of my research work.	30.2%	55.8%	9.3%	4.7%
	Work from home provides me a good platform to get my research work done without any hindrances.	9.5%	16.7%	57.1%	16.7%
	Work from home makes me more alike the part time researchers.	16.3%	65.1%	11.6%	7%
	The pace of my work (research) from home style is different rather slower than the work from institution.	18.6%	69.8%	9.3%	2.3%
	I feel satisfied with the frequency of my research work done from home.	4.7%	30.2%	55.8%	9.3%
	It is difficult for me to stick to a working routine while staying at home.	27.9%	58.1%	9.3%	4.7%
	Work from home has provided me enough time to focus on and complete my research work before the prescribed time.	7%	34.9%	44.2%	14%
	Work from home acts as a barrier of adequate communication between me and my research guide.	30.2%	44.2%	18.6%	7%
	To work from home increased the interference of my family related strain with my ability to perform research activities as compared to the times before lockdown.	16.3%	46.5%	37.2%	-----
	To work from home decreased my physical fatigue associated with commuting to research work	7%	51.2%	39.5%	2.3%
	Due to work from home, I have to put off doing my work things because of the demands of family at home.	20.9%	58.1%	16.3%	4.7%

Table 2: Percentage statistics

Testing Hypotheses of the study

- There will be a significant difference between the attitudes of male and female researchers toward WFH" (H1 A).
- There will be a significant difference in the attitude of researchers towards their WFH experience based on their marital status (H1 B).
- There will be a significant difference in the attitude of researchers towards their WFH experience based on their position (H1C).

The researchers tried to find out whether the attitude towards WFH is dependent on gender, marital status and position of workers (researchers). Statistical technique of t' test has been used in order to test the hypotheses. The t' values are depicted in the Table. 3 below:

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	t' value	Significance level
WFH Attitude	Male	68	90.35	2.861	0.01
	Female	104	94.50		
Variable	Marital status				
WFH Attitude	Married	44	88.00	4.12	0.01
	unmarried	128	94.53		
Variable	Position				
WFH Attitude	Research scholar	156	93.82	4.357	0.01
	Assistant Professor	16	83.50		

Table 3: WFH attitude differences based on gender, marital status& position of researchers

The table shows that researchers' attitudes toward WFH are influenced by their gender, marital status, and position, with female researchers having a negative attitude towards WFH compared to male researchers, married researchers having a negative attitude compared to unmarried researchers, and research scholars having a negative attitude compared to assistant professors. Thus, the hypotheses which states *"there will be a significant difference between the attitudes of male and female researchers toward WFH" (H1 A)*, *there will be a significant difference in the attitude of researchers towards their WFH experience based on their marital status' (H1 B)* and *'there will be a significant difference in the attitude of researchers towards their WFH experience based on their position' (H1 C)* stands accepted.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

WFH was made the only option to the entire world through COVID-19. In the wake of the Pandemic, researchers' work and lives have changed dramatically. The opinions of researchers in this study show that they have both positive and negative aspects of their WFH experience. Work-from-home is a flexible alternative that can be used temporarily for emergencies and crises, and in reaction to job or employee emergent situations, as well as permanently for jobs that are of such permitting nature. Surprisingly, an overwhelming majority of respondents (80%) agreed that WFH allowed them to be more flexible with their working hours. 69.7% of the respondents agreed that work-from-home acknowledges one's ability to operate autonomously. Activities that include co-workers or team members are naturally more suited to the workplace, but jobs that require concentrated attention, such as writing a manuscript or analysing data, are better accomplished from home. Because of WFH, 55 percent of the researchers in the study agreed that their reading of literature and analysing the data collected for their research projects has improved. WFH reduced physical exhaustion connected with commuting to research work, according to 58.2 percent of respondents. It can be explained by the fact that the researchers saved time and energy that would have been lost otherwise in traffic

jams and spending long periods of time away from home. In this way, researchers may refocus on their duties to themselves and their work by reallocating time and energy that might otherwise be wasted.

Despite of these perks, it is evident from the study that most of the researchers are having negative attitude towards WFH as 86% of the researchers are not satisfied with the progress of their research work due to WFH. Among the respondents 62.8% disagreed to work more from home after the lockdown as WFH impedes the speed of research's research work progress (79%), decrease productivity of research work (83.7%) and hinders the development of new research skills (83.8%). Moreover, to WFH isolated the researchers from rest of their colleagues and makes them feel lonelier (75.1%) which in turn can diminish the excitement and enthusiasm of the researchers (88.4%). In general, communication amongco-researchers of the research lab/team (86.1%) and communication with the Supervisor/research guide (74.4%) can be challenged by working from home and accordingly it can create difficulties in self-motivation of researchers (83.7%).

Gender appeared as the most consistently connected variable with working from home. In the current study, it was discovered that female researchers have a negative attitude regarding WFH when compared to male researchers. Work-life balance is expected to be an issue for female researchers in the long run, especially during times of lockdown when all family members are at home and the females are responsible for all house and family tasks. During the COVID-19 outbreak, female scientists' academic productivity and research time were disturbed more than men's, most likely due to childcare responsibilities (Frederickson, M. 2020; Myers, et al. 2020). According to Stevenson and Wolfers (2009), working from home can be more or less beneficial to overall life satisfaction depending on the interactions between work and personal life. These interactions are likely to differ by parental status and gender, as evidenced by the dilemma of female happiness reduction.

In comparison to unmarried researchers, married researchers had a negative opinion regarding WFH, according to the study. The majority of married respondents are less eager to work from home than single respondents, according to the study carried out by Shareena, P., & Shahid, M. (2020). The married researchers are more prone to face family-work conflict because they have families at home. In the current study, 79% of respondents agreed that they have to put aside work on a regular basis due to family obligations at home. In the study of AbuJarour, S. et al, 2021, family-work conflict emerged as a common feature that drove a negative attitude toward WFH. Majority of the respondents who are not willing to work from home are those having children at home (AbuJarour, S. et al, 2021). The married researchers were overburdened with the obligation of home-schooling their children during the lockdown, which may have altered their attitude toward WFH.

According to another study finding, research scholars have a more negative perception regarding WFH than assistant professors. Assistant professors are expected being more secure in their life and receive a higher income than simple research scholars. WFH requires a quiet and peaceful home setting as well as high-speed internet. Because the internet hosts the great majority of communications, installing a high-speed connection at home demands additional duties and expenditures for the worker. Additionally, assistant professors have access to a number of files and facilities that are not available to simple research scholars.

To conclude, more research on working from home during and after a pandemic is required. Interviews and focus groups with workers, line managers, human resource professionals, and top managers are suggested as data collection approaches. Many academics have grappled with work-life boundaries that have become significantly more complex than before, according to the findings of this study, a concern that university administrators must address. By arranging for home workers to commute to work once or twice a week for follow-up on work, the disadvantages of hindered communication can be avoided in the future. Simultaneously, more training and feedback can be employed to improve virtual meeting and interaction efficiency. Furthermore, regardless of the pandemic lockdown, researchers who live with dependent children can take advantage of the benefits of working from home less than those who do not have childcare responsibilities. Taking care of children is undoubtedly a major cause of task overload and, as a result, work-family conflict. As a result, when defining work arrangements, organizations should pay careful attention to employees' childcare issues. It should be obvious, however, that other caring responsibilities, such as looking for elderly or disabled family, should also be recognised. Additionally, in order to avoid linking non-work life with family life, a larger range of life circumstances, such as those who live alone, should be considered. The extensive research on work-life conflict should aid us in examining the problem and developing coping techniques that are appropriate for academics. To cope with the dissolution of traditional work-life boundaries, researchers, like other workers, must create new arrangements and

abilities. A thorough examination of the factors in researchers' WFH lives would be required to determine how research and education institutions could best facilitate this transformation. There is unlikely to be a one-size-fits-all solution for increasing employee productivity and happiness. When working from home, life circumstances often limit how much control people have over their work-life boundaries.

REFERENCES

- [1.] AbuJarour, S., Ajjan, H., Fedorowicz, J., & Owens, D. (2021). How Working from Home during COVID-19 Affects Academic Productivity. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 48, pp-pp. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.04808>
- [2.] Amabile, T., & Kramer, S. (2013, July 24). Working from home: A work in progress. *Harvard Business Review*, <https://hbr.org/2013/07/working-from-home-a-work-in-pr>
- [3.] Baruch, Y. (2001). The status of research on teleworking and an agenda for future research. *International journal of management reviews*, 3(2), 113-129.
- [4.] Binder, M., & Coad, A. (2016). How satisfied are the self-employed? A life domain view. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(4), 1409-1433.
- [5.] Cooper, C. D., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). Telecommuting, professional isolation, and employee development in public and private organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(4), 511-532.
- [6.] Crosbie, T., & Moore, J. (2004). Work-life Balance and Working from Home. *Social Policy and Society*, 3(3), 223-233. doi:10.1017/S1474746404001733
- [7.] Felstead, A., & Henseke, G. (2017). Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being and work-life balance. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 32(3), 195-212.
- [8.] Fonner, K. L., & Roloff, M. E. (2012). Testing the connectivity paradox: Linking teleworkers' communication media use to social presence, stress from interruptions, and organizational identification. *Communication Monographs*, 79(2), 205-231.
- [9.] Frederickson M. COVID-19's gendered impact on academic productivity [Internet]. GitHub. 2020. <https://github.com/drfreder/pandemic-pub-bias>
- [10.] Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(6), 1524-41. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524> PMID: 18020794
- [11.] Grant, C. A., L. M. Wallace, P. C. Spurgeon, C. Tramontano, and M. Charalampous. 2019. Construction and Initial Validation of the e-Work Life Scale to Measure Remote eWorking. *Employee Relations* 41 (1): 16-33. doi:10.1108/ER-09-2017-0229.

- [12.] Gurstein, P. (1996). Planning for telework and home-based employment: Reconsidering the home/work separation. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 15(3), 212-224.
- [13.] Hilbrecht, M., Shaw, S. M., Johnson, L. C., & Andrey, J. (2008). 'I'm home for the kids': contradictory implications for work-life balance of teleworking mothers. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 15(5), 454-476.
- [14.] Hill, E. J., Ferris, M., & Mårtinson, V. (2003). Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues (traditional office, virtual office, and home office) influence aspects of work and personal/family life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(2), 220-241.
- [15.] Korbel, J. O., & Stegle, O. (2020). Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on life scientists. *Genome biology*, 21(1), 1-5.
- [16.] Kossek, E. E., & Thompson, R. J. (2016). Workplace flexibility: Integrating employer and employee perspectives to close the research-practice implementation gap. *The Oxford handbook of work and family*, 255.
- [17.] Kreiner, G. E., Hollensbe, E. C., & Sheep, M. L. (2009). Balancing borders and bridges: Negotiating the work-home interface via boundary work tactics. *Academy of management journal*, 52(4), 704-730.
- [18.] Kurland, N. B. & Bailey, D.E. (1999). The advantages and challenges of working here, there, anywhere, and anytime. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(2):53-68. doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)80016-9.
- [19.] McCloskey, D. W., & Igarria, M. (2003). Does "out of sight" mean "out of mind"? An empirical investigation of the career advancement prospects of telecommuters. *Information Resources Management Journal (IRMJ)*, 16(2), 19-34.
- [20.] Messenger, J. C., and L. Gschwind. (2016). Three Generations of Telework: New ICTs and the (r)Evolution from Home Office to Virtual Office. *New Technology, Work and Employment* 31 (3): 195-208. doi:10.1111/ntwe.12073
- [21.] Myers, K. R., Tham, W. Y., Yin, Y., Cohodes, N., Thursby, J. G., Thursby, M. C., ... & Wang, D. (2020). Unequal effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on scientists. *Nature human behaviour*, 4(9), 880-883.
- [22.] Nilles, J. M. 1988. Traffic Reduction by Telecommuting: A Status Review and Selected Bibliography. *Transportation Research Part A: General* 22 (4): 301-317. doi:10.1016/0191-2607(88)90008-8.
- [23.] Pinsonneault, A., & Boisvert, M. (2001). The impacts of telecommuting on organizations and individuals: A review of the literature. *Telecommuting and virtual offices: Issues and opportunities*, 163-185.
- [24.] Reuschke, D. (2019). The subjective well-being of homeworkers across life domains. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 51(6), 1326-1349.
- [25.] Richardson, J., & McKenna, S. (2014). Reordering spatial and social relations: A case study of professional and managerial flexworkers. *British Journal of Management*, 25(4), 724-736.
- [26.] Shareena, P., & Shahid, M. (2020). Work from home during COVID-19: Employees perception and experiences. *Global Journal for Research Analysis*, 9(5), 7-10.
- [27.] Singley, S. G., & Hynes, K. (2005). Transitions to parenthood: Work-family policies, gender, and the couple context. *Gender & Society*, 19(3), 376-397.
- [28.] Stevenson, B. and Wolfers, J. (2009). The paradox of declining female happiness. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 1(2):190-225.
- [29.] Sullivan, C., & Lewis, S. (2001). Home-based telework, gender, and the synchronization of work and family: perspectives of teleworkers and their co-residents. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 8(2), 123-145.
- [30.] Van der Horst, M., Van der Lippe, T., & Kluwer, E. (2014). Aspirations and occupational achievements of Dutch fathers and mothers. *Career Development International*, 19(4):447-68.
- [31.] Van Der Lippe, T. (2007). Dutch workers and time pressure: Household and workplace characteristics. *Work, employment and society*, 21(4), 693-711.
- [32.] Van der Lippe, T., Jager, A., & Kops, Y. (2006). Combination pressure: The paid work-family balance of men and women in European countries. *Acta Sociologica*, 49(3), 303-319.
- [33.] Venkatesh, V. (2020). Impacts of COVID-19: A research agenda to support people in their fight. *International Journal of Information Management*, 55.
- [34.] Vyas, L. & Butakhieo, N. (2021). The impact of working from home during COVID-19 on work and life domains: an exploratory study on Hong Kong. *Policy Design and Practice*, 4(1): 59-76, DOI: 10.1080/25741292.2020.1863560
- [35.] Wheatley, D. (2017). Employee satisfaction and use of flexible working arrangements. *Work, employment and society*, 31(4), 567-585.